

**Application reference: 24/1869/HOT**  
HAM, PETERSHAM, RICHMOND RIVERSIDE WARD

Date application received	Date made valid	Target report date	8 Week date
22.07.2024	22.07.2024	16.09.2024	16.09.2024

**Site:**

43 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YD

**Proposal:**

Hip-to-gable roof extension with dormer to the rear roofslope. Removal of chimney. Two rooflights installed on the front roofslope and replacement windows to front and rear elevations..

**APPLICANT NAME**

Ms Lan Tao  
43 Lammas Road  
Ham  
Richmond Upon Thames  
TW10 7YD  
United Kingdom

**AGENT NAME**

Mr Rocky Sek  
29 Green Lane  
New Malden  
KT3 5BN

**DC Site Notice:** printed on and posted on and due to expire on

**Neighbours:**

8 Burnell Avenue, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YE, - 25.07.2024  
6 Burnell Avenue, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YE, - 25.07.2024  
30 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YB, - 25.07.2024  
34 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YB, - 25.07.2024  
32 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YB, - 25.07.2024  
45 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YD, - 25.07.2024  
41 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YD, - 25.07.2024

**History: Development Management, Appeals, Building Control, Enforcements:**

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 24/1869/HOT  
Date: Hip-to-gable roof extension with dormer to the rear roofslope. Removal of chimney. Two rooflights installed on the front roofslope and replacement windows to front and rear elevations. Removal of rear garden store.

Development Management

Status: PCO Application: 24/1980/HOT  
Date: Vehicular crossover to driveway. Rear extension with integrated rooflights

Building Control

Deposit Date: 29.10.2013 Installed a Gas Boiler  
Reference: 13/FEN08104/GASAFE

Building Control

Deposit Date: 17.03.2022 Install a replacement consumer unit  
Reference: 22/NIC00735/NICEIC

<b>Application Number</b>	<b>24/1869/HOT</b>
<b>Address</b>	43 Lammas Road, Ham, Richmond, TW10 7YD
<b>Proposal</b>	Hip-to-gable roof extension with dormer to the rear roofslope. Removal of chimney. Two rooflights installed on the front roofslope and replacement windows to front and rear elevations. Removal of rear garden store.
<b>Contact Officer</b>	Izabela Moorhouse
<b>Target Determination Date</b>	16/09/2024

## 1. INTRODUCTION

This application is of a nature where the Council's Constitution delegates the authority to make the decision to Officers rather than it being determined by the Planning Committee.

Before preparing this summary report the planning officer considered any relevant previous planning applications in relation to the development and considered any comments made by those interested in the application such as consultees with specialist knowledge and nearby residents.

By indicating that the development proposal complies with relevant Local Plan Policies, the planning officer has considered the information submitted with the application, any previous relevant applications, any comments received in connection with the application and any other case specific considerations which are material to the decision.

## 2. DESCRIPTION OF THE SITE AND ITS SURROUNDINGS

The site comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling located on the western end of Lammas Road. The property is not listed, does not constitute a Building of Townscape Merit (BTM) and is not designated within a Conservation Area. It is subject to the following constraints:

- Area Susceptible to Groundwater Flooding >=25%
- Article 4 Direction Basements – Basements
- Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan Area
- Ham and Petersham Village.

## 3. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL AND ANY RELEVANT PLANNING HISTORY

The proposed development comprises the *“Hip-to-gable roof extension with dormer to the rear roofslope. Removal of chimney. Two rooflights installed on the front roofslope and replacement windows to front and rear elevations. Removal of rear garden store”*.

The comprehensive list of planning history can be found above. No relevant history for the site.

## 4. CONSULTATIONS CARRIED OUT

The list of neighbours notified of this application are listed above.

No letters of representation were received.

Neighbour amenity considerations are assessed under Section 6 (impact on neighbour amenity) in the report below.

## AMENDMENTS

The description of development has been amended in order to more accurately reflect the scope of the proposals.

## 5. MAIN POLICIES RELEVANT TO THE DECISION

### NPPF (2023)

The key chapters applying to the site are:

- 4. Decision-making
- 11. Making effective use of land

- 12. Achieving well-designed places
- 16. Conserving and enhancing the historic environment

These policies can be found at:

<https://www.gov.uk/guidance/national-planning-policy-framework>

### London Plan (2021)

The main policies applying to the site are:

- D4 Delivering good design
- D12 Fire safety

These policies can be found at: <https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/london-plan>

### Richmond Local Plan (2018)

The main planning considerations applying to the site and the associated Local Plan policies are:

Issue	Local Plan Policy	Compliance	
Local Character and Design Quality	LP1	Yes	No
Impact on Amenity and Living Conditions	LP8	Yes	No
Impact on Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	LP21	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted\\_local\\_plan\\_interim.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/15935/adopted_local_plan_interim.pdf)

### Richmond Publication Local Plan (Regulation 19 version)

The Richmond Publication Version Local Plan (Regulation 19 version) was published on 9 June 2023 for public consultation which ended on 24 July 2023.

The Publication Version Local Plan, together with all the representations received during the representation period, the plan and its supporting documents were submitted to the Secretary of State for examination on 19 January 2024. The submission documents do not form part of the statutory development plan for the Borough, however, by publishing and submitting the Borough Local Plan for independent examination the Council has formally confirmed its intention to adopt the Publication Plan.

The Publication Version Local Plan, including its evidence base, are material considerations for decision-making. The weight to be given to each of the emerging policies and allocations will depend on an assessment against the criteria set out in paragraph 48 of the NPPF. As the Council considers the emerging Borough Local Plan to be sound and legally compliant, officers and Councillors should accord relevant policies and allocations significant weight in the determination of applications taking account of the extent to which there are unresolved objections to relevant policies. Therefore, the weight afforded to each policy at this stage will differ depending on the level and type of representation to that policy. This is addressed in more detail in the assessment below where it is relevant to the application.

Note that it was agreed by Full Council on 27 April, when the Publication Plan was approved, that no weight will be given to Policy 4 in relation to the increased carbon offset rate, and therefore the existing rate of £95 will continue to be used; in addition, no weight will be given to Policy 39 in relation to the 20% biodiversity net gain requirement; all other aspects and requirements of these policies will apply.

Issue	Publication Plan Policy	Local	Compliance	
Flood Risk and Sustainable Drainage	8		Yes	No
Local Character and Design Quality	28		Yes	No
Amenity and Living Conditions	46		Yes	No

### Ham and Petersham Neighbourhood Plan (2019)

The main policies applying to the site are as follows:

Issue	Plan Policy	Compliance	
Protecting Green Character	C1	Yes	No
Character and Context Appraisal	C2	Yes	No

These policies can be found at

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn\\_plan\\_2018\\_to\\_2033\\_january\\_2019.pdf](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/media/16749/hpn_plan_2018_to_2033_january_2019.pdf)

## **Supplementary Planning Documents**

Design Quality  
House Extension and External Alterations  
Ham and Petersham Village Planning Guidance

These policies can be found at:

[https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning\\_policy/local\\_plan/supplementary\\_planning\\_documents\\_and\\_guidance](https://www.richmond.gov.uk/services/planning/planning_policy/local_plan/supplementary_planning_documents_and_guidance)

## **Other Local Strategies or Publications**

Other strategies or publications material to the proposal are:  
Community Infrastructure Levy

## **Biodiversity Net Gain**

The planning authority, for the purposes of determining whether to approve a Biodiversity Gain Plan, if one is required in respect of this permission would be the London Borough of Richmond upon Thames.

There are statutory exemptions and transitional arrangements which mean that the biodiversity gain condition does not always apply. Based on the information available this permission is considered to be one which will not require the approval of a biodiversity gain plan before development is begun because the proposal is development which is subject of a householder application within the meaning of article 2(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2015. A 'householder application' means an application for planning permission for development for an existing dwellinghouse, or development within the curtilage of such a dwellinghouse for any purpose incidental to the enjoyment of the dwellinghouse which is not an application for change of use or an application to change the number of dwellings in a building.

## **6. EXPLANATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

The key issues for consideration are:

- i Design and visual amenity
- ii Impact on neighbour amenity
- iii Flood Risk
- iv Fire Safety
- v Biodiversity

### **i Design and visual amenity**

*Policy LP1 states that the Council will require all development to be of a high architectural and urban design quality. The high-quality character and heritage of the borough and its villages will need to be maintained and enhanced where opportunities arise. Development proposals will have to demonstrate a thorough understanding of the site and how it relates to its existing context, including character and appearance, and take opportunities to improve the quality and character of buildings, spaces, and the local area. Development must respect, contribute to, and enhance the local environment and character.*

*The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations encourages the retention of the original form of the host property and any alterations should enhance the quality of the building. The original appearance should always be the reference point when considering any changes. In terms of extensions, they should not dominate the existing house and should harmonise with the original appearance.*

*The Councils SPD relating to House Extensions and External Alterations states that the overall shape, size and position of side and rear extensions should not dominate the existing house or its neighbours. It should harmonise with the original appearance, either by integrating with the house or being made to appear as an obvious addition.*

*The SPD sets out that hip to gable alterations are not desirable and will not be encouraged when the roofscape and space between buildings are important features of the character and that part of the street*

and there is symmetry within the terrace in which the building is located.

### Roof extensions

The proposal seeks permission for a hip to gable roof extension, although these are usually undesirable, neighbouring properties along the road feature hip to gable alterations, in particular nos. 3 and 18 and therefore, whilst it is not a predominant characteristic for the area, the proposal would not appear out of character for the area. In consideration of this, no objection is raised to the hip to gable alteration in this instance.

With regard to the rear dormer, the SPD sets out that dormers should not project above the ridgeline should be avoided to the front of a house and should not dominate the original roof by setting the extension in from either side and leaving an area beneath a new dormer. The dormer is sited to the rear of the property and is set up from the eaves and the boundary, albeit a modest set in. Although the overall size of the dormer is large, it is considered that the proportions are justified by the presence of large dormers within the same street, including neighbouring properties at no. 3, 23 and 31, which ensures the proposal does not unbalance the setting of the area. The materials used are to match existing which also provides a degree of integration with the host dwelling.

The windows proposed at dormer level are considered acceptable as the design reflects that of those proposed at lower floors are an acceptable size which retains a satisfactory window hierarchy and maintains verticality.

### Other works

Two rooflights are proposed to the front elevation. These would have minimal impact on the appearance of the building and are not objected to.

Replacement windows are proposed to the front and rear elevations, these are of a similar design to the existing and do not increase the size of the openings. The applicants benefit from permitted development rights and in consideration of this also, no concerns are raised to the fenestration works.

The removal of the chimney is accepted as these have been removed on neighbouring properties to facilitate roof extensions.

In view of the above, the proposal complies with the aims and objectives of policies LP1 of the Local Plan and policies 28 of the Publication Local Plan as supported by the East Sheen Village Planning Guidance.

## **ii Impact on neighbour amenity**

*Policy LP8 states that development must protect the amenity and living conditions of existing, adjoining and neighbouring occupants. Design must allow for good daylight standards, avoid overlooking or noise disturbance, avoid visual intrusion, overbearing impacts or harm to the reasonable enjoyment of the uses of buildings and gardens. Harm may arise from various impacts such as noise, air pollution, odours or vibration.*

*The SPD on House Extensions and External Alterations notes that generally an extension of 3m in depth for a terraced property will be acceptable. Where the proposed extension seeks a larger depth, the eaves should be reduced to 2.2m at the shared boundary to mitigate detrimental impact on neighbours such as sense of enclosure or overbearing. However, the final test of acceptability is dependent on the specific circumstances of the site which may justify greater rear projection.*

The site is adjoined by no. 41 to the east and neighboured by no. 45 to the west. Given distance, the residents of Burnell Avenue would not be impacted as a result of the development as the proposals benefit from an appropriate degree of separation due to the large rear gardens.

The proposal is not considered to result in a loss of light to neighbouring occupiers as the dormer will not block light given location at roof level and distance between the site and no. 45. While the dormer will introduce new windows at a higher level, these are not considered to result in lines of sight above mutual overlooking given the tight-knit development pattern and the presence of upper floor windows. As such, no issues of overlooking are anticipated as a result of the development that would warrant reason for refusal.

The dormer and hip to gable alteration do not exceed the maximum ridge height or extend further than the existing building and so is not considered to result in a harmful sense of enclosure, visual intrusion or overbearing impacts. It is not considered that the proposals would create an unreasonable level of enclosure compared to the existing, it is SPD compliant and considered acceptable.

No objections are raised to the replacement windows to the front and rear elevations as these do not increase the size of the openings.

### iii Flood Risk

*Policy LP21 states that all development should avoid, or minimise, contributing to all sources of flooding, taking account of climate change and without flood risk elsewhere.*

A Flood Risk Assessment has not been submitted to the Council. The site is located within various other flood risk constraints, as listed in the first section. The proposals include a modest increase in floorspace located on upper floors; the ground floor internal finished floor levels remaining unchanged. As such, it is not considered that any additional risk to flooding would arise, thus the proposal complies with policy LP21.

### iv Fire Safety

*London Plan policy D12 requires the submission of a Fire Safety Statement on all planning applications.*

A Planning Fire Safety Strategy has been submitted to the council – received 22/07/2024.

A condition has been included to ensure this is adhered to on an ongoing basis. The applicant is advised that alterations to existing buildings should comply with the Building Regulations. Overall, the scheme can therefore be considered consistent with this Policy D12 of the London Plan.

### v Biodiversity

Biodiversity net gain became mandatory for minor developments on applications made from 2<sup>nd</sup> April 2024. This application is exempt from mandatory biodiversity net gain on the grounds that is a householder application.

## 7. LOCAL FINANCE CONSIDERATIONS AND OTHER MATTERS

Section 70(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) provides that a local planning authority must have regard to a local finance consideration as far as it is material. The weight to be attached to a local finance consideration remains a matter for the decision maker. The Mayor of London's CIL and Richmond CIL are therefore material considerations.

On initial assessment this development is not considered liable for the Mayoral or Richmond CIL however this is subject to confirmation by the CIL Administration Team

## 8. RECOMMENDATION

This recommendation is made following careful consideration of all the issues raised through the application process.

Paragraph 11 of the Framework explains how the presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. For the reasons set out above, this application falls to be determined in accordance with the test under section 38(6) of the 2004 Act, the proposal is in general conformity with the Development Plan overall and there are no material considerations of sufficient weight to justify refusal.

**Grant planning permission subject to condition**

### Recommendation:

The determination of this application falls within the scope of Officer delegated powers - YES / NO

### I therefore recommend the following:

- |    |                      |                                     |
|----|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. | REFUSAL              | <input type="checkbox"/>            |
| 2. | PERMISSION           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. | FORWARD TO COMMITTEE | <input type="checkbox"/>            |

This application is CIL liable

YES\*       NO

(\*If yes, complete CIL tab in Uniform)

This application requires a Legal Agreement  YES\*  NO  
(\*If yes, complete Development Condition Monitoring in Uniform)

This application has representations online (which are not on the file)  YES  NO

This application has representations on file  YES  NO

Case Officer (Initials): .....IZM..... Dated: .....28/08/2024.....

**I agree the recommendation:**



~~Team Leader~~/Head of Development Management/Principal Planner

Dated: ...29/08/2024.....

This application has been subject to representations that are contrary to the officer recommendation. The Head of Development Management has considered those representations and concluded that the application can be determined without reference to the Planning Committee in conjunction with existing delegated authority.

Head of Development Management: .....

Dated: .....